



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/159,833	09/24/1998	KENICHI UTSUMI	1990.62597	5612

24978 7590 12/08/2006

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN
300 S WACKER DR
25TH FLOOR
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

JACKSON, JENISE E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 12/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Supplemental
Notice of Allowability

Application No.

09/159,833

Examiner

Jenise E. Jackson

Applicant(s)

UTSUMI ET AL.

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to 6/27/05.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 1,3,4,6-18,20 and 21.
3. ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.
THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
5. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
- (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
- 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date _____.
- (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____.
- Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2. ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3. ☐ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08),
Paper No./Mail Date _____
4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit
of Biological Material
5. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6. ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413),
Paper No./Mail Date _____
7. ☐ Examiner's Amendment/Comment
8. ☒ Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance
9. ☐ Other _____


AYLZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner's Statement

1. The Applicant has amended the claims, dated 6/27/05. The Amendment includes a claim 3, in which the word *wherein* has been removed from the claim. The Amendment does not change the scope of the claims.

Reasons For Allowance

2. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-14, 15-18, 20-21, are allowable for the features of: "when an access authorization is requested without entering a password compares the first password and the second password; if in agreement, issues an authorization, and if not, refuses to issue an authorization"; "wherein in the case where a same value has been preserved in the first password and the second password, the password verifying unit copies, a value of the first password to the user input password and collates the same with the second password, thereby permitting an access". The reasons why the claims are allowable for these features is listed below:

3. In the prior art of passwords; prior art fails to disclose or suggest, when an access authorization is requested without entering a password compares the first password and the second password; if in agreement, issues an authorization, and if not, refuses to issue an authorization"; "wherein in the case where a same value has been preserved in the first password and the second password, the password verifying unit copies, a value of the first password to the user input password and collates the same with the second password, thereby permitting an access". An example of prior art that fails to disclose these features is Morisawa et al. Morisawa discloses a password processing function that allows a user to input a first password and second password. Morisawa discloses that a comparison module compares the compressed bit row,

Art Unit: 2131

which are converted from the password with the compressed bit row of the registered password, if there is a coincidence between the compressed bit rows of the two passwords access is allowed. This in contrast, to the claims, which claims, "when access authorization is requested without entering a password compares the first password and the second password, and if in agreement issues authorization". Prior art of passwords, and more specifically Morisawa, discloses a first password that is entered by a user is compared to the registered password.

4. Another example of prior art of passwords, that fails to disclose or suggest, when an access authorization is requested without entering a password compares the first password and the second password; if in agreement, issues an authorization, and if not, refuses to issue an authorization"; "wherein in the case where a same value has been preserved in the first password and the second password, the password verifying unit copies, a value of the first password to the user input password and collates the same with the second password, thereby permitting an access", is Paryzch et al. Paryzch discloses preventing unauthorized access to the hard drive unit by placing an access password on the hard drive itself. Paryzch discloses that the hard drive contains two passwords. The first is a user-defined password and the second is a manufacturer password. Only one of the passwords is required to unlock the hard drive. In contrast, to claims, prior art of passwords fails to disclose or suggest, "when an access authorization is requested without entering a password compares the first password and the second password; if in agreement, issues an authorization, and if not, refuses to issue an authorization"; "wherein in the case where a same value has been preserved in the first password and the second password, the password verifying unit copies, a value of the first password to the user input password and collates the same with the second password, thereby permitting an access". The prior art of

Art Unit: 2131

passwords compares a user input password to a stored password for comparison, and if the same than access is authorized.

5. In the prior art of Security, prior art fails to disclose or suggest, “when an access authorization is requested without entering a password compares the first password and the second password; if in agreement, issues an authorization, and if not, refuses to issue an authorization”; “wherein in the case where a same value has been preserved in the first password and the second password, the password verifying unit copies, a value of the first password to the user input password and collates the same with the second password, thereby permitting an access”. An example of prior art that fails to disclose the limitations above is, Felt. Felt discloses authenticating a first party with a first password set, and providing a second party with a second password set. Felt discloses that the password sets have a common member. Felt discloses that the first and second party are authenticated to each other if they contain a common member in their passwords. This is in contrast, to claims, that claim, when an access authorization is requested without entering a password compares the first password and the second password; if in agreement, issues an authorization, and if not, refuses to issue an authorization”; “wherein in the case where a same value has been preserved in the first password and the second password, the password verifying unit copies, a value of the first password to the user input password and collates the same with the second password, thereby permitting an access”. Thus, prior art of network security, fails to disclose or suggest, the limitations above.

6. In the prior art of Networking, prior art fails to disclose or suggest, “when an access authorization is requested without entering a password compares the first password and the second password; if in agreement, issues an authorization, and if not, refuses to issue an

Art Unit: 2131

authorization”; “wherein in the case where a same value has been preserved in the first password and the second password, the password verifying unit copies, a value of the first password to the user input password and collates the same with the second password, thereby permitting an access” . An example of prior art that fails to disclose or suggest, the limitations above, is Huynh et al. Huynh discloses a method of changing a password. The system of Huynh discloses a first receiver for receiving a first password. The system includes a decrypting module for decrypting information in a file that was encrypted with the first password. The system of Huynh discloses a verification module for verifying the decrypted information, and a second receiver for receiving a second password. This is in contrast to claimed limitations that disclose, when an access authorization is requested without entering a password compares the first password and the second password; if in agreement, issues an authorization, and if not, refuses to issue an authorization”; “wherein in the case where a same value has been preserved in the first password and the second password, the password verifying unit copies, a value of the first password to the user input password and collates the same with the second password, thereby permitting an access” .

7. In the prior art of Non-patent literature, fails to suggest or teach, “when an access authorization is requested without entering a password compares the first password and the second password; if in agreement, issues an authorization, and if not, refuses to issue an authorization”; “wherein in the case where a same value has been preserved in the first password and the second password, the password verifying unit copies, a value of the first password to the user input password and collates the same with the second password, thereby permitting an access” . An example of non-patent literature that fails to teach or suggest, the limitations above

Art Unit: 2131

is Rupp. Rupp teaches a default password, master password, and the ability to hard lock a drive. The default password allows a user to set a password once and use it continually. Rupp teaches that the default password is used to automatically lock the hard drive if no new password is entered. In contrast to claims that discloses, when an access authorization is requested without entering a password compares the first password and the second password; if in agreement, issues an authorization, and if not, refuses to issue an authorization". The prior art of Rupp teaches when a user does not input a password, using the default password. There is no teaching or suggestion of comparing the first password with a second password if the password is not entered. There is no mention of Rupp of comparison of two passwords that are the same; the master password and the default password are not compared with each other. Thus, the prior art of non-patent literature fails to teach or suggest the limitations above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jenise E Jackson whose telephone number is (571) 272-3791. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (6:00 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.) alternate Friday's.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2131

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



December 5, 2006



AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100